

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. Patent 6,915,270) in view of Barnes (U.S. Patent 6,950,802). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection for the following reason.

Claim 1 requires defining an engagement model. According to Applicants' specification page 53, lines 15 - 17, the engagement model 502 of FIG. 15 is developed in a similar manner to engagement model 106 of FIG. 1. Page 10, lines 17 - 19, states that engagement model 106 describes a system and method for implementing a typical project. The engagement model of claim 1 is similar to the engagement model of Barnes (U.S. 6,950,802) to which the present invention is related as specified on page 1, lines 5 - 8.

However, claim 1 thereafter requires that this engagement model be used to create an industry-wide engagement template applicable to all businesses in the marketplace (the marketplace being the marketplace which the engagement model addresses). See also applicants' specification page 53, line 22, to page 54, line 9. Barnes does not describe creating such an industry-wide engagement template. According to Barnes' column 3, lines 49 - 52, his engagement template 108 describes the system and method for an actual project. There is no suggestion that this actual project is industry-wide or applicable to all businesses in the marketplace.

The Examiner cites Young FIG. 6 and column 13 lines 61 -  
END920010071US1

09/882,148

-2-

66, as disclosing the step of creating an industry-wide engagement template applicable to all businesses in the marketplace. A careful reading of the cited portion of Young reveals that this is not so. Young's FIG. 6 and column 13, lines 61 - 66, illustrate a hypothesis and data framework which is a set of tools and templates including a plurality of hypotheses and a plurality of questions which are used to determine which facts need to be collected in response to issues and objectives. But, this does not describe in any way applicants' claim 1 requirement of using the engagement model defined in step 1 to create an industry-wide engagement template.

Young, therefore, does not describe this important step of claim 1. And, as noted above, Barnes also does not describe this step. Nor, is there any way suggested to combine Young and Barnes in order to describe this step. Rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) therefore is in error. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1.

Independent claim 8 recites a similar step and is therefore also allowable for the same reason. Allowance is urged.

All of the remaining claims depend directly or indirectly on allowable claims 1 or 8 and are therefore also allowable.

Applicants therefore request withdrawal of the rejection of all of the pending claims and allowance of these claims.

END920010071US1

09/882,148

-3-

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 07/31/06

By: John Pivnichny  
John R. Pivnichny  
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358

Fax: (607)429-4119

END920010071US1

09/882,1

48

-4-